

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 are pending. Claims 1-4 have been amended, and claims 5-8 have been added. The Applicants respectively request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

**The Examiner has not returned initialed copies of the forms PTO-1449 that were submitted along with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on June 11, 2001 and October 6, 2003, respectively. Pursuant to MPEP §609, Applicants hereby respectfully again request that the Examiner initial the originally-submitted Forms PTO-1449 (copies of which are attached hereto for the Examiner's convenience) in the appropriate place in the left-hand column as proof that the listed references have been considered and made of record, and return initialed copies of each form to the undersigned as soon as possible.**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-4 have been amended as follows.

Specifically, the phrase "wherein each of the nodes sends to the data relay unit a request-to-send to send" in claim 1 has been amended to recite "wherein each of the nodes is for requesting a predetermined response from the data relay unit based on an occurrence of an event in the node..." for purposes of clarity. Claim 4 has been amended in a similar manner.

Further regarding claim 1, recitation of the activation request sending means has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "activation request sending means for sending to at least a destination network, which includes a destination node for receiving the notice of the occurrence of the event, an activation request for requesting the destination network to be activated when the data relay unit receives a node request for the predetermined response..." to clarify that the destination network is the element being activated. Claim 4 has been amended in a similar manner.

Claim 4, lines 10-11 have also been amended so that “occurrence of event” is now recited as “occurrence of an event.”

In view of the above amendments to claims 1 and 4, claims 1-4 are now in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1-4 be withdrawn.


The Examiner should note that claims 2 and 3 have also been amended for cosmetic purposes and not in response to any rejection by the Examiner.

The Examiner should also note that claims 5-8 have been added to further distinguish the present invention from the art of record and in a manner that is supported by the specification and drawings. In particular, claim 7 recites features of the second embodiment as discussed, for example, on pages 11-12 of the specification, while claim 8 recites features of the second embodiment as discussed, for example, on pages 13-15 of the specification.

The Examiner apparently has not addressed the patentability of the present claims, as the Office Action does not include a form PTO-892 listing references found in the Examiner’s search. However, as the scope of the claims would have been evident to one skilled in the art (even taking the 112, second paragraph issues raised by the Examiner into consideration), Applicants question why the claims were not examined on the merits, and assert that any subsequent action on the merits should be a non-final action.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. If questions relating to patentability remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone. Please charge any unforeseen fees that may be due to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DGP', is written over a horizontal line.

David G. Posz  
Reg. No. 37,701

DGP  
Posz & Bethards, PLC  
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 10  
Reston, VA 20190  
Phone 703-707-9110  
Fax 703-707-9112  
Customer No. 23400

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please replace the originally-filed drawing sheet including FIG. 4 with the attached replacement sheet. As shown in the attached replacement sheet, FIG. 4 has been amended to correct a spelling error in the decision box identified by reference number 209. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

**Attachment:** One (1) Replacement sheet (amended FIG. 4)